G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1899-00

~~191~~ .

S+A File No. 43/99

Serial Nos. 1–5

(~~Separate Returns~~)

Later references. S. & A.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1–5

Major Part B for

SUBJECT.

pension to B. Srinivasa aiyangar late police Inspector of Hiriyur Taluk.

Indexed

Countermarked

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

Sd/A 43-99

Submitted thro' Judl. Br.

In his Memo No. 1698/69 dated 8th November 1897 the Inspector Gl. of Police ordered the retirement of Inspector B. Sreenivasiengar owing to certain irregularities in the discharge of his duties. This order shd. have been at once communicated to Govt. & sanction obtained thereto as the Inspr. Gl. had no power to retire the official in question who was only 52 years of age on 20th Nov/97 — the date on which his retirement was given effect to. As a rule the retirement of a public servant should be ordered only with the sanction of Govt.

Govt. provided such retirement is otherwise permissible under the rules in force.

A spare copy of the order regarding the certificate of age referred to by the Pl. Councillor is put up.

27/4/00

Read

:Letter No.3588/310 dated 9th April 1900 from the Inspector General of Police, forwarding the pension application of B.Srinivasiengar, late Police Inspector of the Hiriyur Taluk, and stating that the Inspector was ordered by the late Inspector General of Police to be retired with effect from the 20th Novr. 1897, on account of certain irregularities in the discharge of his duties, that he was 52 years old and had rendered a service of 30 years & 4 months at the time of his retirement, that through oversight the sanction of Govt. to the retirement of the Inspector was not applied for at the time, and requesting that such sanction may now be accorded, and that the pension application may be forwarded to the Comptroller for verification.

Order;--- Dated Bangalore, 1900

Under the circumstances brought

to notice, the order of the late Inspector Gen ral of Police directing the r tirement of B.Srinivasiengar, late Police Inspector of the Hiriyur Taluk, with effect from the 20th November 1897, is approved.

The pension application will be forwarded to the Comptroller for v rification and report at an early date.

H

for Secretary.

To

The Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

,, Comptroller, Mysore Government,

(with the Inspr. Genl's letter & enclosures, in original, -- to be returned).

Submitted to the Hon'ble for appl

23/4/98

Note

The Comptroller is
submitting an application
for pension on behalf of
B. Srinivasiengar late Pol
Inspector of the Hiriyu
Taluk duly verified an
reported on for orders of
Govt

(1) draws attention of Govt
to art. 317 (a) of the
Mysore Service Regulations
for the full pension or
a reduced one being
Sanctioned to him
and

(2) requests to determine
the class of pension to
be Sanctioned as he
was under 55 years of
age at the time of
retirement.

Regarding point (1)

The applicant was
tered from Service on
ccount of certain
regularities in the
ischarge of his duties
hile he was in charge
the Shellakere Taluk.

Please see Offl Memo
o. 1698/69 d 8/11/97 forwarded
ith the Police Inspector
nerals' letter No. 3588/310 d:
4-00). From the history
Service recorded on the
page of the pension
pplication, it is apparent
hat his pay was reduced
wice in the course of
is service once from
s 45+15 to Rs 35+10 in
November 1878 and at
nother time from *
Rs 45+15 to Rs 20
in November 1881.

Full pension is given
a matter of distinction
and provided the Service
has been thoroughly
satisfactory. (Vide Art. 31

Orders are solicit
as to whether in such
circumstances full
pension or a reduced on
(if latter, what amoun
of reduction is to be mad
is to be sanctioned to
applicant.

Regarding point (2)

The applicant was
retired from Service fr
20th November 1897 whe
he was 52 years old.
He was not discharged
from the Service on accoun
of reduction of establish
-ment to entitle him
to a compensation pension
He was not permanently
incapacitated

Subd.

The amount of ~~full~~
pension to which Srinivasa
Iyengar is entitled according
to the Comptroller's certificate
is Rs 21—11—6. If any
reduction is considered
necessary, the amount may
be reduced by 11 annas and
6 pies or that full amount
may be allowed in consideration
of the applicant's premature
retirement.

JB
31/7/1901

capacitated by bodily
mental infirmity to
title him to an Invalid
pension. He was not
borne 55 years of age
the time of retirement
entitle him to a
peranuation pension
he has not retired
oluntarily after completing
ualifying Service to
title him to a retiring
ension.

In such circumstances
e Comptroller requests
determine the class
pension, as the applicant's
case does not fall
under any of the above
4 classes of pension.
Though the applicant
has not retired voluntarily,
as he has put in a
qualifying service

J

of 30 years and odd, it seems that his pension may be classed under "Retiring"

Subd for orders.

DMB
27/7/01.

Submitted to Secty.

29/7/01

DMB
31/7/1901

He may be given a retiring pension without any reduction.

7/8

To the 3rd Councillor.

(P&A 18) 7/8

Retiring pension may be granted without any deduction for the reasons stated by the Treasurer. Period of service 30 years.

9/8

DMB 12/8/01

1899 Ethno 350 Dy 11 1899

From

The Assistant Superintendent of Police, Bangalore District

To

The Assistant Superintendent of Police Chitaldroog District Through the Deputy Commissioner

Dated 8th
Despatched 9th } December 1899
Received

General No. 421
No.

Enclosure No.

His yadee No: 345 of 28. 8. 1899 furnishing the details of Services rendered by the late Inspector Srinivasa Iyengar in the District and requesting to forward an extract of his service Register at an early date.

Has the honor to state that from the Service Register

Register Kept in the office extract of which is herewith attached it is seen that the above Inspector has served in this District as Sub-Inspector and Inspector between 15-4-1875 and 22.11.1880.

(2) A reference to the Talukes having been made for the verification by barawards of the services of this Inspector, extracts from the baravards were received and are herewith sent for reference. These extracts do not cover the full period of his service from the 15th April 1875 to 30th June 1883 and the requisite references for the broken periods are reported to be not forthcoming. References are probably available in the Comptroller's office. A separate statement shewing the periods for which baravard extracts are available and those for which they are not is also herein enclosed for ready reference.

"Copy"
(Signed) K. R. Sreenivasiengar
For Deputy Commissioner.

(Signed) K. R. Sreenivasiengar
For Deputy Commissioner.

"Copy"

A Rangacharya
Inspector General of Police.

~~189~~ 1900 Ellore 398/1900

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District

To

The Inspector General
of Police.

Dated 16th
Despatched 18th } January 1900.
Received

General No. 273
No.

Enclosure No.

Has the honor to for-
ward herewith for favor
of Sanction the Pension
papers of Police Inspector
Kunjal Sreenivasaiengar
late of the Hiriyur Taluk

The Inspector was
retired under the Inspector
General's Order No 1698/69
dated 8th November 1897.

The Inspector's service
is

30 years and 4 months and age at the time retirement was 52 years. As the Inspector was Compulsarily retired no medical certificate was obtained.

19 days pay in November 1894 is due to the Inspector and a bill has been submitted to the Comptroller for audit hence no last pay certificate has been attached.

The assistant Superintendent of Police, Bangalore, to which District most of the service not verified by Barawards, belongs states in his docket No: 421 dated 8th December 1899. (Copy enclosed for information) that requisite references are not forthcoming and that they may probably be found in the Comptrollers' office.

Requests therefore that the wanting information may kindly be got from the Comptroller and the papers disposed of early.

(signed) D.K. Darashah.
for Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District.

"Copy"

A Rangaswamy
Inspector General of Police.
42

No: $\frac{1698}{69}$ dt 8.11.1897. Sdt H-43-00

Official Memo

Enclosure 1200 35/98 35/40 — dt 9-4-1900

Read:-

(1) Correspondence ending with the Chitaldroog Deputy Commissioner's letter No: 90 dated 14th September 1897.

---

(2) A petition dated 22.12.96 from Mahadevamma of Dodchellur, Chelle-Kere Taluq, alleging that the Police took no steps in the case in which his house was broken into on the 2nd. October 1896 and property worth about Rs 600/- was stolen which was forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner for report on the 23rd. January 1897.

The Deputy Commissioner submitted his report on the 11th. May 1897. As this did not enter into details and was not satisfactory, a further report was

was called for on the 5th. July 1897.

3. The Deputy Commissioner has replied to this on the 14th. September submitting also a memo from the Assistant Superintendent shewing what steps he took in the case.

4. This report also does not attempt to give seriatim replies to the several queries in the Inspector General's letter, or to the allegations in the petition.

(a) 1st. query — about the action of the Police.

The Patél of Dodchellur reported at the Parasurampur Police station at 2 P.M. on 3.10.1896 about the case of housebreaking. The Duffedar sent on the report the same day to the Inspector. The Inspector-

"what d the higher officers of Police do when there was a clear case of house breaking and twelve persons were implicated in it and only one was put up for trial and convicted."

Sreenivasiengar

Sreenivasiengar came to Parasurampur on the 5th Evening and sent in his first diary on the 6th october, after examining Rudranna, brother of the complainant, the complainant and the Patel.

This diary gives the facts elicited The second special diary is dated 7th to 8th. No further examination is held and the Inspector appears to regard the complaint as not true. On this diary the Superintendent ordered that the Enquiry should be completed within a week. But no notice appears to have been taken of this order. No further enquiry was held and no final report made.

5. What the Inspector did in the first instance therefore amounts

to

to the Examination of a few witnesses and the exchange of cart wheels with the Patel. He slept over the case afterwards, as did also the Superintendent. Even if a B report had been submitted at once, the need or otherwise for further enquiry might possibly have been determined early by the Magistrate.

6. The third diary is dated 29.10.1896, and was so to speak forced on the Inspector. For, in the interim, one of the offenders Dodchellura by name came voluntarily to the ghat outpost Constable Khasim Sab at evening meal's time on the 21st October (when the constable was on his way to Dodchellur) and handed over his part of the stolen property,

and

and incriminated 11 others in the offence. His story was that the Patel of the Village wanted him to return his share of the booty to the Patel, and that on his refusing to do so, the Patel, caused him to be severely beaten in the jungle by 4 or 5 persons. Escaping from his persecutors, he hid himself for 5 or 6 days, and then came and handed himself over to the Police. The third diary gives the above facts.

7. The fourth diary is dated 31.10.1896, after writing which Dodchellura was charge sheeted and placed before the Amildar Magistrate, who convicted him to one month's rigorous imprisonment

On

on the 9th November 1896.

8. Neither the diaries nor the Deputy Commissioner's report throws any light on some of the minor points alleged in the petition, which however, are important as shewing the way in which the subordinate Police investigate offences.

9. The petitioner alleges that Wodchellura was taken by the constable to the Parasurampur station, that a report of the circumstances was sent to Head Quarters by the Duffedar, that no reply coming for 2 or 3 days, the Duffedar took the man himself to Chellakere, (a distance of 12 miles), that the Inspector then came with the accused back to station, thence

Sent

sent for the Patel and others from Dodchellur (7 miles) and thereafter went with them to Dodchellur. There is nothing to shew how far these statements are true.

10. The Inspector Generals' Query also requires information as to what further action was taken by the higher officers of Police after the conviction of Dodchellurayya. From the records it is evident that little or nothing was done. The Inspector sent in no more diaries, and apparently made no further investigation. He makes in his explanation the plausible excuses that in spite of the conviction he was inclined to regard the whole complaint as false, as in his experience of 26 years he

he had never come across a man voluntarily confessing to the Police, and that the Amildar held a subsequent enquiry. Both these excuses are of no value. The Superintendent writes on the fourth diary that the Inspector told him that the Amildar told the Jamedar that he (the Amildar) would himself hold the inquiry and writes further that the Superintendent would "watch" the Amildar's Enquiry. The Superintendent has apparently done nothing except this "watching" and his explanation is highly unsatisfactory and shews clearly that the Superintendent does not realize the

res-

responsibilities of his position.

11. Now for the Amildar's Enquiry.

He reports that he went to the spot and made Enquiry. The petitioner alleges that the Amildar sent for the Patel and the accused and some others to appear at Challekere. It should have been stated by the Deputy Commissioner whether the enquiry was held and completed on the spot or at head quarters. The enquiry was began on 2.12.1896 at Challakere and depositions were taken there. The Amildar in his report states that he subsequently went to the village, but no examination of witnesses appears to have been made on the spot. The under-

signed

undersigned is afraid his Enquiry was mainly confined to the examination of the witnesses at headquarters.

12. The Amildar sent in his report on 31.12.1896 in which he states that none of the other accused admit the offence. He did not apparently make any further Police investigation into the case. In the report he further states that he is inclined to believe that the Patel connived at the robbery and that the Patel was suspected to be con-
-cerned in several other acts of lawless-
-ness, such as breaking a person's gun, healing another, filling in a well dug by a third, and

...

breaking into the house of a fourth &c.
In this last case also, a B report was
submitted by the Police. It should be
noted here that the petitioner had
submitted a petition direct to the
Deputy Commissioner which was sent
on to the Amildar, and the report
of the Amildar was in reply to this.
Thus there was practically no tho-
rough Police investigation even by
the Amildar.

13. This report was seen by the
Deputy Commissioner on the 1st. February
1897 and he wrote on it that he
would visit the Village in April.
He does not however appear to have
held any local investigation then.

on

on the 1st. April 1897 the petitioner was examined at Chitaldroog and on the 11th two witnesses - Nirvanappa and Marappa. This enquiry related only to the wheels and did not extend to the case of house breaking, or the report of lawlessness.

14. After receipt of the Inspector General's order the Deputy Commissioner held a second inquiry on the spot at the close of August. The proceedings of this enquiry have not been submitted. As the result of this enquiry the Patel was suspended for two years.

15. The answer to Inspector General's query No: 2 is that no action was taken,

"What action did the higher officers of Police take to put down the high-handedness of the Patel and Shanbogue which the Amildar confirms after personal enquiry on the spot"

taken to put down the highhandedness of the Patel and Shanbhogue till after the receipt of the Inspector General's order.

"Have the Police done anything to get the complainant back his jewels".

16. The answer to query No: 3 is that nothing appears to have been done subsequently in the case.

"Did the Police Assistant Superintendent make any inquiry or take any intelligent interest in the case."

17. Query 4. The Police Assistant Superintendent from his own admission made no enquiry, and took no intelligent interest in the case.

18. Queries 5 and 6 have been answered in the note.

19. The Deputy Commissioner states that the Inspector took no intelligent interest in the case either in the beginning or after the conviction of Dodchellura. He-

He does not, however, express any opinion as to whether the Inspector's clinging to his original theory that the case was false is due to mere perversity or has to be explained otherwise.

In any case, the mismangement of this case is enough to shew that the Inspector is no longer fit to discharge his duties satisfactorily. The Deputy Commissioner recommends that he should be given a less responsible charge. But considering his suspicious conduct in this case and in the complaint of Sanna Mallah in which further enquiry was ordered in this office Docket No. 1680/68 dated 6th instant and also the general reputation of this Inspector as gathered

gathered from the inquiries made by the Inspector General when he was last in Chitaldrug District, it is not desirable to have the Inspector any longer in the Police department. He will be at once retired on such pension as he may be entitled to.

The records are herewith returned

(Signed) V. P. Madhava Rao

Inspector General of Police.

"Copy"

Inspector General of Police.

22

OFFICE OF THE
9795
11-4-00
DEPARTMENT OF

P & A 1439

J 1081.

1900.

1344

From

The Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Depts.

Dated

Despatched 9 April 1900.

Received

General No. 3588

No. 310

Enclosure No. 5

Submitting for sanction pension application on behalf of B. Sreenivasappa late Asst Inspector/Hiriyur taluk & requesting that sanction may be accorded for the retirement of Inspector & the pension roll transmitted to the Comptroller for verification.

Subject to Govt. order & draft
11
23/4/00

Sd/ 7-43-00.

P & A
11.4.00

Transferred to
and 14.4.00. the Judicial Branch
This C. Revds.
11
18/4/00

OFFICE OF THE

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

No. 355
310

Bangalore 9 April 1900.

From

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith for sanction under article 307 (a) of the Mysore Service Regulation the pension roll of B. Srinivasaiyar, late 3rd. Grade Inspector of Police of the Hiriyur Taluk. He was retired from Service with effect from the 20th. November 1897 for his irregularities in Connection with certain cases while he was in Charge of the Chellakere

Taluq

Taking. Copy of this office Memo ~
number $\frac{1698}{69}$ dated 8th. November 1897
setting forth fully the charges against
the Inspector together with the orders
of the Inspector General retiring him
from Service is herein enclosed for the
information of Government....

Sanction of Government for the retire-
ment of the individual on pension
should have been obtained immediately
after the order, but this appears to
have been omitted through an oversight
2. As regards the age of the Inspector,
he was 52 years old when he was retired.
His service amounts to 30 years and
4 months as will be seen from the
history of Service at page 2 of the

pension

pension roll. He had served in the Bangalore, Tumkur, and Chitaldroog Districts and for some portions of his service references are reported not to be forthcoming by the Assistant Superintendent of Police, Bangalore, vide his docket No: 421 dated 8th. December 1899 to the Assistant Superintendent of Police, Chitaldroog. (Copy enclosed for reference.) These portions may be verified in the Comptroller's office as suggested therein.

3. The last pay certificate of the Inspector has not been received with the pension roll. The Deputy Commissioner explains in his docket No: 273 dated 16th. January 1900, (Copy enclosed) that due to him a bill for pay for 19 days in November

1897 has been forwarded to the Comptroller for audit. The same will be obtained and forwarded to Government.

4. The delay in the preparation and submission of the pension roll was due to the difficulty in the verification of the Inspector's services in the different Districts. I beg that sanction may be accorded for the retirement of the Inspector and the pension roll transmitted to the Comptroller for verification.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

Arangaram

Inspector General of Police.

2.2

J 1148



From

The Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Depts.

84 #43-002

Dated

Despatched 5 May 1900

Received

General No. 3905

No. 339

Enclosure No. one

Submitting cost-pay certificate of B. Sreenivasa Iyengar, Cole 3rd grade Constables of the Kolar Range.

J Pr

Rec'd

0.5.00

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF [illegible] MYSORE.

No. 3905/339 Bangalore 5th May 1900.

In one

THE [illegible]

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND [illegible] DEPARTMENTS.

In continuation of this office letter No: 35-88/310 dated 9th March 1900, I have the honor to forward herewith the last pay certificate of B. Srinivasiengar, late 3rd Grade Inspector of the Hiriyur Taluq, received from the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldroog District.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

K. Kaundy
Inspector General of P[illegible]

P+A - 95.

118

Sent with a Rokefounders.
DRB
27/7/01.

916
20-7-01 190

...N OF MYS.

FROM

E. R. SUBRAYER, Esq.,

COMPTROLLER, GOVT. OF MYSORE.

S+A 43-00-3

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.

GEN. & REV. DEPTS.

Dated 17

Despatched 19 July 1901

Received

General No. 430

P&A No. 31

Enclosure No. 1

SUBJECT.

Forwarding an application for Pension (~~Gratuity~~) reported on for the orders of Government on behalf of K. Ramaswamy

P+A Requisition sent
Jas 23-7-01. DRB 23.7.01.
Please forward the application with the Requisition
Requisition sent DRB 22/7/01.

	Remarks by Head of Office.
1. As to character and past conduct of applicant	Good but retired for misconduct vide Inspector General's docket no 1698 dated 8.11.1897 & Sanctioned by Govt vide Proceedings No. 1324-5/69 J 139 of 27th July 1900
2. Explanation of any suspension or degradation	[redacted] Explained in the remarks.
3. Regarding any gratuity or pension already received by applicant (see Chapter XIX)	nil
4. Explanation under Article 279 so far as the Head of the Office can give it.	nil
5. Any other remarks	nil
6. Specific opinion of Head of Office whether the service claimed is established and should be admitted or not [see Article 278 (b)]	The Service claimed is established and should be admitted. — for Deputy Commissioner, Chikkaballapur

Certificate and Report of Comptroller.

Certified that (subject to the remarks below recorded) qualifying service in ~~inferior or~~ superior grades has been duly proved for 30 years, 4 months, 22 days and that a ~~Compensation~~ Pension (~~or Gratuity~~) not exceeding Rs. (21-11-6) twenty one, annas eleven, & pies six is admissible under Article 320 (1) of the Mysore Service Regulations. The calculations have been duly verified. The Pension (~~or Gratuity~~) is chargeable to General Revenues, and has been computed at 30/60 of the average emoluments drawn during the last five years of service. Rs. 43-7-0

Govt Pro. No. 1324-26/J.139 of 27 July 1900.

COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,
Bangalore, the 17 July 1901

Comptroller, Mysore Govt.

Attention is invited to Article 317 (a) of the Regulations.

with ref. to the remarks under 6 Column 1, a question arises as the class of Pension was also to be determined by Govt

Finl. 104.]

APPLICATION FOR PENSION OR GRATUITY.

58

1. Name of applicant— Kunigal Srinivasaiengar

2. Father's name— Vee Mataraiengar

3. Race, sect and caste— Sri Vishanava Brahmin

4. Residence— Kunigal, Tumkur District.

5. Present or last employment, including name of establishment— Police Inspector Mysore Chitaldroog Dt

6. Date of beginning of service— 28th June 1867 (1st)

7. Date of ending of service— 19th November 1897 (L.P.C.) Y. 5m M. D.

8. Length of service, including interruptions 30-4-22

of which Superior 30-4-22

Inferior ... ... ——

Non-qualifying and interruptions ... ... ——

9. Class of Pension or Gratuity applied for, and cause of application— ~~Superannuation~~ Invalid Pension Retired by the Resumption sanctioned in G.P. No: 1324/1267 Revenue dt 8-11-1897

10. (Average) emoluments or pay— 43-12-0 P. 13-3-1698 dated 8-11-1897

11. Proposed Pension— 21-11-6 ~~2/3rds~~ 13-4 Twelfths annual rate, Mysore Cy

12. Proposed Gratuity— ——

13. Date from which Pension is to commence— 20-11-1897

14. Place of payment— Kunigal Tumkur District

15. Date of applicant's birth by Christian era†— 1845

16. Height— 5 ——

17. Marks— Short & scar on the forehead

18. Date— 24th June 1900

Sd/- Subbarao

Dy Deputy Commissioner

Signature of Head of Office.

Chitaldroog Dist

* If the application is for a Compensation, Pension or Gratuity, the nature of the change of establishment which has given rise to the claim should be fully stated.

† If not known exactly, must be stated on the best information or estimate.

History of the Service (showing interruption) of Retired Police Inspector Kunigal Srinivasaiengar Hirizur Taluk Chitaldrug District

Establishment.	Appointment.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of beginning	Date of ending.	Period reckoned as service. Y.	M.	D.	Period not reckoned as service. Y.	M.	D.	Remarks.	How verified.	Remarks by Comptroller.
Revenue Department	Maramuttu Gumasta	20		28-6-1867	11-10-1868	1	3	13					By Service Register	Service from 28-6-67 to 19
—do—	Revenue Accountant	25		12-10-1868	23-3-1870	1	5	12					By Baramahdy	Nov/97 admitted
—do—	Maramut Peon	25		24-3-1870	31-3-1870			8					—do—	in the verification
—do—	Revenue Peon	25		1-4-1870	31-8-1870		5						—do—	Vide Dft Journal
—do—	Revenue Peon	25		1-9-1870	16-4-1876	4	7	16					By Service Register & Baramahdy	Leave can be regulated under Columns 10 & 11
Police Department	Sub Inspector	35+10		17-4-1875	11-3-1877	1	10	25						Page 6 Sheet 2
—do—	Police Inspector	45+15		12-3-1877	3-11-1878	1	7	22					By Service Register & Baramahdy	Certificate to be furnished by the Collector
—do—	Sub Inspector	35+10 reduced		4-11-1878	30-11-1880	2		27					By Service Register & Baramahdy	Vide Note decided in Chief Office
—do—	Inspector	45+15 raised		1-12-1880	8-11-1881		11	8					By service Register & Baramahdy	
Revenue Department	Head Gumasta	20		9-11-1881	3-4-1882		4	25					By Service Register	
Police Department	2d class Inspector	35+10		4-4-1882	24-7-1883	1	3	21						

2d Class Inspectors											by Barawards.
Permanent											
Police Inspectors 3d grade	40+12	-	1- 5-1887	29-2-1896	8	10	-	-	-	-	— do —
Police Inspectors 3d grade	50+15	-	1- 3-1896	19-11-1897	1	8	19	-	-	-	— do —
					30	4	22				

Read:-

Letter No. 3588/310 dated 9th April 1900, from the Inspector General of Police submitting the pension application of B. Srinivasa Iyengar, late Police Inspector of the Hiriyur Taluk.

2. Letter No. 3905/339 dated 5th May 1900, from the same Officer, forwarding the last pay certificate of Srinivasaiyengar.

Order thereon No. 1324-25/139 dated 27-7-00.

In the first of the letters read above, the Inspector General states that B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Police Inspector of the Hiriyur Taluk, was advised by his predecessor to be retired from service on account of certain

certain irregularities committed by him in the discharge of his duties. ~~This order should have been communicated to~~ The question of Govt should have been referred to the Secretary of State ~~for~~ ~~Government and their sanction obtained thereto~~ as the Inspector General ~~had no power to~~ retire the official in question who was only 52 years old on 20th November 1897, the date on which his retirement was given effect to. ~~Further~~ If it is proved that there has been a delay of more than 2 years in reporting the matter for the orders of Government, for which no satisfactory explanation is given. However as the man has been actually removed from Service, Govt are pleased to approve

of the late Inspector General's order directing the retirement of the said B. Srinivasagam with effect from 20th November 1897. ~~In this connection they wish to draw~~ 2. The Inspector General's attention to draw to para 5 of their Govt. Proceedings No. 7973-8012 G. 714-19 dated 12th January 1900 ~~and requiring Heads of Departments to impress upon them the necessity~~ to obtain a certificate of age from the Comptroller prior to ~~his~~ recommending the retirement of any official, and it is observed that no such ~~in order to avoid difficulties~~ certificate has been obtained in ~~such~~ as brought to notice ~~in~~ the present case.

(Note - This retirement was ordered before the date of these proceedings (C.M.)

3. ~~Further~~ the Inspector General instead of asking Government to forward the Pension

Pension Roll to the Comptroller for verification, should have himself obtained all necessary information from the latter and submitted the same to Govern-
ment, ~~which he is now re-~~
~~quired to do.~~

25/7/00
Secretary

To
The Inspector General of Police, returning the original enclosures of his letters read above
" Comptroller to the Govt of Mysore.

SN
24/7/1900.

Sgt. Rs 1500-S

Read:—

Letter No. 430/P&A 31 d: 17th July 1901 from the Comptroller to the Govt of Mysore submitting duly verified and reported on for the orders of Govt an application for pension on behalf of Sreenivasiengar late Police Inspector of the Hiriyur Taluk. and requesting that the class of pension may be determined

Order thereon No. 2926-27/P&A 171 dt 16-8-'01

The applicant Sreenivasiengar late Police Inspector of the Hiriyur Taluk was retired from Service under Govt Ord: No. 1324-5/J 139 d: 27th July 1900, when he was 52 years old. He has rendered a net qualifying service of 30 years, 4 months and

and 22 days in the ~~of~~
superior grade. The Govt
are pleased to direct that
his pension may be classed
under "Retiring" and to
sanction under the provision
of articles 312 and 320(b)
of the Mysore Service Regulation
the payment to him of a retiring
pension of Rs (21-11-6)
twenty one, annas eleven
and pies six only per—
mensem ~~to him~~ with
effect from the 20th
Nov 1897, the amount
of pension being debited
to "Gl Revenues".

3rd ors ordr) Draft

For Secty

PM
12/8/01

To The Comptroller with copy
of the 1st page of the
pension applr
The D. of J Robes